



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/089,188	07/02/2002	Dov Moran	246/167	4688
71511	7590	11/02/2007		EXAMINER
MARK M. FRIEDMAN				TINKLER, MURIEL S
C/O DISCOVEY DISPATCH , 9003 FLIRIN WAY			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
UPPER MARLBORO, MD 20772			3691	
				MAIL DATE
				DELIVERY MODE
			11/02/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/089,188	MORAN ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Muriel Tinkler	3691

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 August 2007.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-49 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 18-41 and 43-49 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-17 and 42 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) 18-41 and 43-49 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

This application has been reviewed. Claims 1-49 are pending. Claims 1-17 and 42 have been elected. Therefore, claims 18-41 and 43-49 are withdrawn. The rejection(s) are as stated below.

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election with traverse of Group I, claims 1-17 and 42, in the reply filed on August 21, 2007 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that the restriction is not justified because an explanation of why each group is supposedly distinct from the rest was not given. This is not found persuasive because in the Office Action mailed on June 21, 2007, the groupings were distinctly listed on page 2. Groups I-IV are related as combination/subcombinations. As shown, all parts of Group I are similar to Group III EXCEPT what was stated. So, Group I is distinguished from Group II (Group II can be used on video games, general and Internet browsing), and can be applied as a distinction to Group III as well. Similar logic applied to Group IV compared to Group I. Furthermore, Groups V and VI are subject to a species restriction, as stated in the Office Action on page 4.
2. The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

Double Patenting

3. A rejection based on double patenting of the "same invention" type finds its support in the language of 35 U.S.C. 101 which states that "whoever invents or

discovers any new and useful process ... may obtain a patent therefor ..." (Emphasis added). Thus, the term "same invention," in this context, means an invention drawn to identical subject matter. See *Miller v. Eagle Mfg. Co.*, 151 U.S. 186 (1894); *In re Ockert*, 245 F.2d 467, 114 USPQ 330 (CCPA 1957); and *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970).

4. A statutory type (35 U.S.C. 101) double patenting rejection can be overcome by canceling or amending the conflicting claims so they are no longer coextensive in scope. The filing of a terminal disclaimer cannot overcome a double patenting rejection based upon 35 U.S.C. 101.

5. Claim 42 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claim 14 of prior U.S. Patent No. 6,324,537 and claim 18 of prior U.S. Patent No. 6,539,3807. This is a double patenting rejection.

6. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir.

1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

7. A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

8. Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

9. Claim 1 is rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 11 of U.S. Patent No. 6,324,573 and claim 11 of U.S. Patent No. 6,539,380. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because they cover the same content.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

10. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

11. Claims 1-17 and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Moran et al. (US 6,539,380), hereafter referred to as Moran.
12. Regarding claim 1: Moran discloses the same subject matter in claim 11.
13. Regarding claim 2: See the rejection of claim 1 above and claim 7 of Moran.
14. Regarding claim 3: See the rejection of claim 1 above and claim 14 of Moran.
15. Regarding claim 4: See the rejection of claim 3 above and claim 15 of Moran.
16. Regarding claim 5: See the rejection of claim 4 above and claim 16 of Moran.
17. Regarding claim 6: See the rejection of claim 5 above and claim 17 of Moran.
18. Regarding claim 42: Moran discloses duplicate wording in claim 18.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

19. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
20. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to

consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

21. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moran in view of Chang et al. (US 2003/0093812), hereafter referred to as Chang.

22. Regarding Claim 7: Moran discloses the information in claim 1. Moran does not specifically disclose the use of RAM. Chang teaches the use of RAM in paragraph 23. Therefore, it would be obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the use of RAM in the use of a computer system because it allows for the use of temporary memory.

23. Claims 8-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moran as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Chang and Shamoon et al. (US 7,233,948), hereafter referred to as Shamoon.

24. Regarding claim 8: Moran discloses the information in claim 1. While Moran does disclose a chip in the Abstract, Moran does not specifically disclose the use of a cryptographic chip. Chang discloses the use of a cryptographic chip in paragraph 20 and 21. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Moran to include the use of cryptography on the chip because it would make the chip more secure. While Chang discloses that the chip decrypts data, Chang does not specifically disclose that the chip encrypts the data as well. Shamoon teaches the use of encrypting and decrypting data in paragraph 95. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Moran and Chang to include

both encryption and decryption because it would allow the user to read and write data more securely.

25. Regarding claim 9: Moran, Chang and Shamoan disclose the information in claim 8. Chang further discloses an authentication process in paragraph 23.

26. Regarding claim 10: Moran, Chang and Shamoan disclose the information in claim 8. Chang further discloses a chip emulating a smart card in the Abstract and a paragraphs 3, 6, and 23.

27. Regarding claim 11: Moran, Chang and Shamoan disclose the information in claim 11. Chang further discloses storing data on an encrypted smart card in paragraph 23.

28. Regarding claim 12: Moran, Chang and Shamoan disclose the information in claim 8. Shamoan further discloses immediately performing encryption in paragraph 360.

29. Regarding claim 13: Moran, Chang and Shamoan disclose the information in claim 12. Shamon further discloses a cryptographic signature in paragraph 67.

30. Regarding claim 14: Moran, Chang and Shamoan disclose the information in claim 8. Chang further discloses cryptographic chip memory for storing a key in paragraph 23. Shamoan further discloses using removable memory in paragraph 249.

31. Regarding claim 15: Moran, Chang and Shamoan disclose the information in claim 14. Chang further discloses storing encrypted data in chip memory in paragraphs 16 and 23.

32. Regarding claim 16: Moran, Chang and Shamoan disclose the information in claim 15. Chang further discloses that the cryptographic chip can be separate from the flash memory in paragraph 16.

33. Regarding claim 17: Moran, Chang and Shamoan disclose the information in claim 15. See the rejection of claim 1 above.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Muriel Tinkler whose telephone number is (571)272-7976. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 7:30 AM until 4 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Alexander Kalinowski can be reached on (571)272-6771. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

MT
October 26, 2007



HANI M. KAZIMI
PRIMARY EXAMINER